DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 043 SP 020 383

AUTHOR Greener, Jean W.; Thurlow, Martha L.
TITLE Teacher Opinions About Professional Education Training Programs.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Inst. for Research on Learning Disabilities.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO IRLD-RR-68
PUB DATE Mar 82
GRANT 300-80-0622
NOTE 42p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Compliance (Legal); *Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Quality; Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; *Mainstreaming; *Program Effectiveness; Relevance (Education); Schools of Education; Student Problems; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Curriculum; Teacher Education Programs; Teaching Experience; *Teaching Skills; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS Minnesota; Public Law 94 142

ABSTRACT

The extent to which 148 teachers felt that their training programs prepared them to teach students with special needs was examined. A questionnaire was developed to ascertain whether teachers were able to carry out reponsibilities mandated through the passing of Public Law 94-142. Respondents were asked to rate their overall preparation and training in five areas: methods, materials, child and adolescent development and psychology, reading, and mainstreaming. The teachers also rated their preparation for recognizing and handling students having problems with drugs, abuse, learning disabilities, and emotional disturbances. Teachers were asked to suggest major changes that should be made in teacher training programs. Analyses of results were conducted and grouped according to: (1) years of teaching experience; (2) location of training--in Minnesota or elsewhere; and (3) training at public or private institutions. Although most teachers gave good or fair ratings overall to their training programs, poor ratings appeared with great frequency in the areas of reading, mainstreaming, and recognizing students with specific problems. Ratings by teachers with less than five years of experience indicated they were more satisfied with their training than were teachers with 10 or more years of experience. Appendices provide analysis and discussion of the survey's findings and a copy of the questionnaire. (FG)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED217043

# University of Minnesota

Research Report No. 68

# TEACHER OPINIONS ABOUT PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAMS

Jean W. Greener and Martha L. Thurlow

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IRLD

# Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Ysseldyke
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 020 383

IRLD

Director: James E. Ysseldyke

Associate Director: Phyllis K. Mirkin

The Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities is supported by a contract (300-80-0622) with the Office of Special Education, Department of Education, through Title VI-G of Public Law 91-230. Institute investigators are conducting research on the assessment/decision-making/intervention process as it relates to learning disabled students.

During 1980-1983, Institute research focuses on four major areas:

- Referral
- Identification/Classification
- Intervention Planning and Progress Evaluation
- Outcome Evaluation

Additional information on the Institute's research objectives and activities may be obtained by writing to the Editor at the Institute (see Publications list for address).

The research reported herein was conducted under government sponsorship. Contractors are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent the official position of the Office of Special Education.

Research Report No. 68

# TEACHER OPINIONS ABOUT PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAMS

Jean W. Greener and Martha L. Thurlow

Institute for Research on Learning Disbilities

University of Minnesota

March, 1982

## Abstract

Teachers' opinions about the education programs in which they were trained were examined. The 148 teachers responding to a survey indicated that they believed their preparation was poor in several areas related to teaching students with special needs. The teachers' opinions varied as a function of when they received their training; teachers who had been trained within the past five years had more positive opinions about their training programs than did teachers who had been trained over 10 years ago. Implications for professional training programs and school district inservice training programs are discussed.

Teacher Opinions About Professional Education Training Programs

Mainstreaming was an unknown term when many classroom teachers completed teacher education programs. The training provided to teachers equipped them to teach "normal" children and recommended that they refer to special education teachers any child not fitting the "normal" standard.

Educational training has been described as based on a "two box" theory (Reynolds, 1977). Separate educational programs were maintained by the schools, one for "normal" students and one for handicapped students. Teacher training programs for regular and special education also existed separately, with little if any dialogue occurring between the two. The message was clear: the special education teacher was the appropriate person to teach children experiencing difficulty within the regular class curriculum.

Public Law 94-142 seemingly changed overnight the structure within which schools provide education to handicapped children. The law had an immediate impact on the placement of students in classrooms around the country. Teachers suddenly were faced with meeting the special needs of many students without advance preparation or training. Although the law quickly reversed previous policy, the training and skills of teachers did not change as quickly. Further, general education teacher training programs were not prepared at that time to provide the necessary training. The National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped estimated in 1977 that 260,000 special education teachers and over two million regular educators required inservice training to implement the provisions of PL 94-142.

Reynolds (1978) indicated that perhaps the greatest problem facing colleges of education was the "rapidity with which the change to a mainstream philosophy must be effected....Educating children with handicaps requires massive changes in the total structure of schools and education" (p. 385).

The need for change in teacher preparation and certification has been identified. Data on changes in teacher training programs and rules affecting certification give some indication of the extent to which these changes have occurred.

A survey was conducted by Roberson (1980) to determine the extent to which non-special education faculty members were participating in in-service activities related to PL 94-142. Roberson surveyed 128 institutions with certified teacher training programs. Of the 64 teacher training programs responding, only 19% had completed such an inservice program for non-special education faculty; 32% had no such program planned.

To determine whether preparation requirements of preservice educators were changing to include special education courses, Smith and Schindler (1980) interviewed superintendents or Commissioners of Education. The results of their study indicated that 25 states and the District of Columbia had no such requirement. Eleven states indicated the possibility of such a requirement in the future. Fifteen states required preservice general educators to fulfill competencies relating to exceptionality. In another survey (Patton & Braithwaite, 1980), state offices of teacher certification in 44 states indicated that they did not require special education coursework for the recertification of regular classroom teachers. None of the states required regular class teachers to

have direct contact with handicapped students as a part of their recertification requirements.

These studies indicate a general lack in professional education programs and certification requirements related to the needs created by PL 94-142. Future changes occurring in faculty and program competencies in relation to those skills needed will not have primary impact on those teachers already serving in the schools. Yet, teachers now working in the schools are required to meet the special needs of many students placed within their classrooms. The critical issue is how well these teachers believe they have been prepared to deal with the special needs created by PL 94-142.

The current study was designed to ascertain the extent to which teachers in current service felt their training programs prepared them to teach students with special needs. The teachers were asked to evaluate the extent to which the professional education programs they completed prepared them to recognize and teach students with special problems in their classrooms.

## Method

### Subjects

Subjects were 148 teachers in attendance at a workshop held at the beginning of the 1980-81 school year. All teachers were employed by the same district located in a metropolitan area in Minnesota. Attendance at the workshop was mandatory but completion of the "Teacher Survey" during the workshop was voluntary.

The average number of years of teaching experience for the 148 teachers was 12.1 years (range = 0-35 yrs.). Most (45%) of the teachers

were certified in elementary education; the remainder were certified in secondary (26%), K-12 (16%), or other areas (12%). The level of education ranged from a bachelor's degree (63%) to a specialist or doctorate (1.4%); 22.7% had been awarded a master's degree, and an additional 11.4% had earned 15 or more credits beyond a master's (1.4% of subjects did not provide information on level of education).

Analyses were conducted on the responses of the total group of subjects. In addition, subjects were grouped according to the number of years of teaching experience: 5 or less years ($n$ = 42) and 10 or more years ($n$ = 92). The responses of these two groups were compared statistically to determine whether teachers trained after the enactment of PL 94-142 had different attitudes toward their training than did teachers trained at least five years before the enactment of PL 94-142. Further, descriptive analyses of responses were conducted with subjects grouped in two additional ways: (a) according to whether they had been trained within Minnesota or outside of Minnesota, and (b) according to whether they had been trained at a public institution or a private institution. These descriptive analyses are presented in Appendix A.

Materials

A one-page survey was developed to collect information on teachers' opinions about the education programs in which they were trained, with some questions related to their preparation for recognizing and dealing with special problems in the classroom. Items were presented in a multiple-choice format, with the choices being good, fair, or poor. The survey also asked for information on the teachers and their educational backgrounds. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix B.

## Procedure

The survey was distributed to workshop participants at the beginning of the workshop session. A few minutes were provided for completion of the form. The surveys were turned in on a voluntary basis at the conclusion of the workshop.

## Results

Nearly all subjects (n=139) gave an overall rating to the programs in which they were trained. The majority of these subjects (55.4%) indicated that the program was fair; 41.7% rated their programs as good, and 2.9% rated their programs as poor.

Responding subjects with 5 or less years of teaching experience (n=40) generally rated their programs as good (47.5%) or fair (50.0%); 2.5% rated them as poor. Similarly, responding subjects with 10 or more years of teaching experience (n=86) generally rated their programs as good (39.5%) or fair (57.0%); 3.5% rated them as poor.

### Preparation in Five Areas

Teachers were asked to rate the preparation they received in five specific areas of current concern: methods, materials, child/adolescent development and psychology, reading, and mainstreaming. Overall, for methods, materials, and childhood/adolescent development and psychology, most ratings were good, followed by fair. In each of these areas, less than 11% of the subjects rated their preparation as poor. In contrast, the ratings for reading were divided about equally among the three categories. For mainstreaming, the majority of ratings were poor (64.8%); only 14.1% gave their preparation in mainstreaming a good rating.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

Table 2 presents the ratings given to the five areas by the teachers with 5 or less years of experience and the teachers with 10 or more years of experience. The two groups gave similar ratings in all areas except mainstreaming, where significantly more teachers with 5 or less years of experience gave fair ratings (38.1%) than did teachers with 10 or more years of experience (12.6%), $z = 3.36$, $p < .01$, and significantly more teachers with 10 or more years of experience gave poor ratings (74.7%) than did teachers with 5 or less years of experience (38.1%), $z = 4.07$, $p < .01$.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

Preparation for Recognizing Students with Problems

Table 3 presents the percentages of subjects rating their preparation for recognizing students with four types of problems (drugs, abuse, learning disabilities, and emotional disturbance) as either good, fair, or poor. Most subjects gave a poor rating to their preparation for recognizing problems related to drugs, abuse, and emotional disturbance. The ratings given to preparation for recognizing learning disabilities were more positive; 25.2% of the subjects indicated that their preparation in this area was good.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

A comparison of the ratings by teachers grouped according to teaching experience is given in Table 4. Rather striking differences existed in the ratings for all problem areas. In general, the ratings of less experienced teachers were more positive than those of teachers with more experience.

---

Insert Table 4 about here

---

For the drugs problem area, 65.2% of the teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience gave a poor rating to their preparation, while only 26.2% of the teachers with 5 or less years of teaching experience gave a poor rating; the difference between these percentages was significant, $z = 4.07$, $p < .01$. The percentages of teachers in the two groups giving good and fair ratings were not significantly different.

For the abuse problem area, 64.4% of the teachers with 10 or more years of experience gave a poor rating to their preparation, while 26.8% of those with 5 or less years of experience gave a poor rating; the difference between these percentages was significant, $z = 4.04$, $p < .01$. The percentages of teachers in the two groups giving good ratings also were significantly different, but in the opposite direction, $z = 4.32$, $p < .01$.

Similarly, in the LD problem area, significant differences were found between the percentages of teachers in the two groups giving good and poor ratings to their preparation. While 42.8% of the teachers with 10 or more years of teaching experience gave a poor rating, only 16.7% of the teachers with 5 or less years of teaching experience gave a poor rating, $z = 2.93$, $p < .01$. On the other hand, 22.0% of the teachers

with 10 or more years of experience and 40.5% of the teachers with 5 or less years of experience gave good ratings, $z = 2.20$, $p < .05$.

For the ED problem area, 12.1% of the teachers with 10 or more years of experience rated their program as good, compared to 31.0% of the teachers with 5 or less years of experience; the difference between these percentages was significant, $z = 2.62$, $p < .01$. No statistically significant differences existed in the percentages of teachers giving either fair or poor ratings.

Other Problem Areas

Space was provided on the survey for subjects to list other problem areas and rate them. None of the areas listed was given by more than one teacher. Three areas listed were speech, vision, and behavior management; the preparation for recognizing each of these was rated good. Two additional areas listed were rated as fair in preparation; these were recognizing gifted students and relating to parents. Six areas given poor ratings were behavior, discipline, family living, why students hate school, socialization, and social development.

Handling Students with Problems

After rating their preparation for recognizing students having problems with drugs, abuse, learning disabilities, and emotional disturbance, and identifying other problem areas, subjects rated their preparation for handling students with these problems. The teachers' ratings are presented in Table 5. Across all teachers, the most frequent ratings were fair (40.2%) and poor (46.4%); only 13.4% rated their preparation for handling students with the problems as good.

---

Insert Table 5 about here

---

Ratings given by the teachers grouped according to amount of teaching experience also are shown in Table 5. Significant differences in the percentages of teachers in the two groups giving each rating were found: good - $\underline{z} = 2.51$, $\underline{p} < .05$; fair - $\underline{z} = 2.91$, $\underline{p} < .01$; poor - $\underline{z} = 4.56$, $\underline{p} < .01$. More of the teachers with 5 or less years of teaching experience gave good (24.4%) and fair (58.5%) ratings than did teachers with 10 or more years experience (good - 8.1%; fair - 31.4%), and fewer less experienced teachers than more experienced teachers gave poor ratings (17.1% vs. 60.5%).

Recommended Changes in Teacher Training Programs

Subjects also were asked to suggest major changes that should be made in teacher training programs. The responses were numerous and covered a variety of topics. Suggestions fell within two categories--those related to college education classes and those related to student teaching.

Most suggested changes dealt with college education classes. By far the most frequently given suggestion was that classes should provide more definite and/or practical methods and skills for teachers to use ($\underline{n}$=22; 14.9%). The second most frequently given suggestion related to ways to identify and work with special students (specifically, LD and gifted students) ($\underline{n}$=14; 9.4%). Three suggestions were made by nine subjects (6.1%) each; these were that training programs should include (a) instruction on discipline techniques, (b) mainstreaming preparation, and (c) professors with recent classroom experience. Five subjects

(3.4%) noted the need for training in recognizing and dealing with drug abuse/use. No other suggestions relating to college education classes were made by more than two percent of the subjects.

In the area of student teaching, the most frequent suggestion was that more classroom experiences be provided (n=31; 20.9%). This was followed closely by the recommendation that student teaching be extended to start earlier and last longer (n=22; 14.9%). Seven subjects (4.7%) cited the need for both training and experiences in dealing with parents and the community. Five subjects (3.4%) suggested that more experience be provided in a greater variety of teaching situations. No other suggestions relating to college education classes were made by more than two percent of the subjects.

## Discussion

The results of the present survey of teachers working within public school settings clearly identified areas in which teachers find general education preparation programs in need of improvement. Although most teachers gave good or fair ratings overall to their training programs, poor ratings appeared with great frequency when the teachers were rating their preparation related to reading, mainstreaming, and recognizing students having specific types of problems. The large percentage of teachers rating their preparation for mainstreaming as poor suggests that this is an area that should be addressed immediately.

Differences were found between the ratings of teachers with five or less years of teaching experience and those with 10 or more years of teaching experience. In general, the less experienced teachers' ratings

indicated that many of them believed they were better prepared in several areas than did the ratings of the more experienced teachers. These differences suggest that teacher training programs may have changed within the past five years in terms of addressing the needs created by PL 94-142. Yet, even in the areas where more of the less experienced teachers indicated their preparation was good, the percentages of these teachers giving good ratings still were relatively low.

Unfortunately, even if professional education training programs have been restructured to meet the needs arising from PL 94-142, few positions currently are available for recent graduates because of declining school enrollments and budget cutbacks. Thus, those teachers remaining in today's classrooms typically are the ones who received their professional training without the benefit of training in areas related to exceptionalities.

The results of the present study confirm that teachers currently working in schools believe that they have not been adequately prepared to deal with the special needs of many students now placed within their classes. This situation must be addressed now; there is not time to wait for professional education training programs to provide adequate preparation and then wait for teachers with that training to take over teaching positions within the schools. One approach to alleviating the current situation is to organize appropriate inservice programs for teachers currently in classrooms, while at the same time continuing to move state certification departments in the direction of some minimum requirement of competency in exceptionality.

To ensure that regular educators' skills in dealing with exceptional

students improve as rapidly as possible, districts must commit themselves to a continuing inservice program to improve and implement mainstreaming skills. Such planning should involve superintendents and other administrators, such as directors, coordinators, and specialists, as well as school board members, principals, teachers, and community people. This type of broadly based commitment to mainstreaming should provide teachers with consistent encouragement to improve their skills and should result in an improved level of education for all children, not just special needs students.

Some of the skills needed by teachers to effectively implement PL 94-142 are discussed by Reynolds (1978). These include:

(1) Direct experience with exceptional students

(2) Knowledge of consultation skills

(3) Clinical skills

(4) Interaction among the various professional specialties represented in the district

(5) Better preparation for systematic management of instruction

(6) Individualized assessment and instructional planning using diagnostic-prescriptive approaches

(7) Due process procedures

Dialogue needs to occur between regular and special educators and others providing services to exceptional students, such as social workers, speech therapists, etc. Informal communication should be encouraged as well so that acquired skills may be shared.

Districts should assess the skills of their teachers and the needs of the students enrolled in school on a regular basis. As the needs of students change, so should the training and skills of teachers and

others working with them. Use of in-class mainstream facilitators has been an effective means of providing a model for teachers and direct training and support. Inservice training should relate to recently assessed district needs and should follow a consistent pattern.

In summary, we believe changes of the magnitude required to efficiently teach all of the students in school today require ongoing commitment, planning, and training by all associated with the school district.

References

Patton, J. M., & Braithwaite, R. L. PL 94-142 and the changing status of teacher certification/recertification. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1980, 3(2), 43-47.

Reynolds, M. New perspectives on the instructional cascade. In A. M. Rehmann & T. F. Riggen (Eds.), Leadership in special education series: The least restrictive alternative (Vol. 7). Minneapolis: Minneapolis Public Schools, 1977.

Reynolds, M. C. Some final notes. In J. K. Grosenick & M. C. Reynolds (Eds.), Teacher education: Renegotiating roles for mainstreaming. Reston, Virg.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Roberson, J. B. Preservice changes in teacher education relative to mainstreaming. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1980, 3(2), 48-51.

Smith, J. E., & Schindler, W. J. Certification requirements of general educators concerning exceptional pupils. Exceptional Children, 1980, 46, 394-396.

## Footnote

Special thanks is given to administrators and teachers of the school district cooperating in this research. Appreciation also is extended to Lisa Boyum and Yetta Levine for their help in tabulating the data.

Table 1

Percentages of Subjects Rating Five Areas of Preparation as Good, Fair, or Poor

| Area | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Methods | 51.4 | 37.8 | 10.8 |
| Materials | 54.7 | 37.8 | 7.4 |
| Child and Adolescent Development and Psychology | 52.4 | 38.1 | 9.5 |
| Reading | 29.5 | 33.3 | 37.1 |
| Mainstreaming | 14.1 | 21.1 | 64.8 |

Table 2

Percentages of Subjects in Two Groups Rating Five Areas of Preparation as Good, Fair, or Poor

| Area | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Methods | | | |
| 5 or less years | 57.1 | 35.7 | 7.1 |
| 10 or more years | 46.7 | 42.4 | 10.9 |
| Materials | | | |
| 5 or less years | 66.7 | 23.8 | 9.5 |
| 10 or more years | 52.2 | 40.0 | 7.8 |
| Child and Adolescent Development and Psychology | | | |
| 5 or less years | 59.5 | 35.7 | 4.8 |
| 10 or more years | 48.4 | 40.6 | 11.0 |
| Reading | | | |
| 5 or less years | 31.6 | 39.5 | 28.9 |
| 10 or more years | 30.5 | 30.5 | 39.0 |
| Mainstreaming* | | | |
| 5 or less years | 23.8 | 38.1 | 38.1 |
| 10 or more years | 12.6 | 12.6 | 74.7 |

*Significant differences were found between the ratings of the two groups of teachers.

Table 3

Percentages of Subjects Rating their Preparation for Recognizing Four Types of Problems as Good, Fair, or Poor

| Problem | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Drugs | 17.2 | 33.1 | 49.6 |
| Abuse | 15.3 | 31.9 | 52.8 |
| LD | 25.2 | 38.1 | 36.7 |
| ED | 16.3 | 37.4 | 46.2 |

Table 4

Percentages of Subjects in Two Groups Rating their Preparation for Recognizing Four Types of Problems as Good, Fair, or Poor

| Area | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Drugs* | | | |
| 5 or less years | 33.3 | 40.5 | 26.2 |
| 10 or more years | 7.9 | 27.0 | 65.2 |
| Abuse* | | | |
| 5 or less years | 34.1 | 39.0 | 26.8 |
| 10 or more years | 5.6 | 30.0 | 64.4 |
| LD* | | | |
| 5 or less years | 40.5 | 42.8 | 16.7 |
| 10 or more years | 22.0 | 35.2 | 42.8 |
| ED* | | | |
| 5 or less years | 31.0 | 35.7 | 33.3 |
| 10 or more years | 12.1 | 38.5 | 49.4 |

*Significant differences were found between the ratings of the two groups of teachers.

Table 5

Percentages of Subjects Rating their Preparation for Handling Students with Problems as Good, Fair, or Poor*

| Group | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Overall | 13.4 | 40.2 | 46.4 |
| 5 or less years | 24.4 | 58.5 | 17.1 |
| 10 or more years | 8.1 | 31.4 | 60.5 |

*Significant differences were found between the ratings of teachers with 5 or less years of experience and those of teachers with 10 or more years of experience.

## Appendix A

## Results of Analyses of Data by Location of Training

Descriptive analyses of the data were conducted with subjects grouped according to (a) whether they were trained within Minnesota (n=112) or outside Minnesota (n=36), and (b) whether they were trained at a public institution (n=134) or a private institution (n=14).

Overall Program

In their overall ratings of the programs in which they were trained, most of those educated within Minnesota indicated that their preparation for teaching was "fair" (59.4%); 38.7% rated their preparation as good and 1.9% gave their preparation a poor rating. For those subjects educated outside of Minnesota (n=33), about equal percentages rated their programs as good (51.5%) and fair (42.4%); 6.1% rated them as poor.

Subjects educated at public institutions rated their programs as follows: good - 42.4%; fair - 56.0%; poor - 2.4%. Responding subjects educated at private institutions (n=14) rated their programs as follows: good - 35.7%; fair - 50.0%; poor - 7.1%.

Preparation in Five Areas

Table A presents the ratings of five areas of preparation given by subjects trained within Minnesota and outside of Minnesota. The ratings of each area by the two groups were very similar, except perhaps for training related to childhood and adolescent development and psychology, In this area fewer teachers from within Minnesota gave good ratings and poor ratings, and more gave fair ratings than did teachers from outside Minnesota.

---

Insert Table A about here

---

Table A also presents the ratings of five areas of preparation by subjects trained in public and private institutions. The public vs. private comparison revealed differences for reading preparation. A greater percentage of subjects from public than from private schools rated their preparation as good (31.7% vs. 8.3%) and a smaller percentage rated their preparation as poor (35.0% vs. 58.3%). Yet, for both groups, the percentage giving a poor rating was greater than the percentage giving a good rating. Other ratings by subjects educated in public and private institutions generally were comparable to each other.

Preparation for Recognizing Students with Problems

Table B presents the ratings given by subjects educated within and outside Minnesota to their preparation for recognizing students with various kinds of problems. Again, the percentages of teachers giving each rating were quite similar, with the possible exception of their ratings for the LD and ED problem areas. In both of these cases, the ratings of subjects educated outside of Minnesota were somewhat more positive.

---

Insert Table B about here

---

Differences in teachers' ratings of their preparation for recognizing students with specific problems were more evident when comparisons were made between subjects educated in public vs. private institutions. For recognizing drugs and abuse problems, the ratings of subjects educated within private institutions were more positive than those of

subjects educated within public institutions. However, for recognizing LD and ED students, the pattern was the opposite. Most notably, 92.8% of the subjects from private institutions gave fair or poor ratings to their preparation for recognizing LD students, while 72.9% of the public institution teachers gave fair or poor ratings.

Handling Students with Problems

Table C gives the teachers' ratings of their preparation for handling students with problems related to drugs, abuse, learning disabilities, and emotional disturbance. Of those teachers educated within Minnesota, 45.3% gave a poor rating to their preparation for handling students with problems, compared to 59.1% of those teachers educated outside Minnesota.

---

Insert Table C about here

---

The ratings given by teachers educated within public and private institutions also are presented in Table C. More teachers educated within public institutions gave good ratings; none of the teachers educated at private institutions gave a good rating to their preparation for handling students with problems related to drugs, abuse, LD, and ED.

Summary

When grouped according to where they received their training, the teachers' responses reflected the variability in professional education programs. This variability was indicated by the differences in teachers' ratings of the extent to which they felt they had been adequately prepared in various areas. For example, many more of the teachers educated within

private institutions indicated that their preparation for teaching reading was poor. On the other hand, many more of the teachers educated within public institutions believed that their preparation for recognizing students with drug or abuse problems was poor. Although differences are evident between teachers' ratings of various teacher training institutions, all types of institutions did receive several poor ratings. Focusing on select types of institutions does not appear to be an approach that will efficiently improve teachers' preparation. Rather, attention should be given to upgrading the skills of teachers currently in schools through inservice training and increased communication among school professionals.

Table A

Percentages of Subjects Rating Five Areas of Preparation as Good, Fair, or Poor

| Area | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Methods | | | |
| Within MN | 50.9 | 39.3 | 9.8 |
| Outside MN | 52.8 | 33.3 | 13.9 |
| Public | 53.0 | 36.6 | 10.4 |
| Private | 35.7 | 50.0 | 14.3 |
| Materials | | | |
| Within MN | 54.5 | 40.2 | 5.4 |
| Outside MN | 55.6 | 30.6 | 13.9 |
| Public | 55.2 | 38.0 | 6.7 |
| Private | 50.0 | 35.7 | 14.3 |
| Childhood and Adolescent Development and Psychology | | | |
| Within MN | 49.1 | 43.8 | 7.1 |
| Outside MN | 62.8 | 20.0 | 17.1 |
| Public | 51.1 | 39.1 | 9.8 |
| Private | 64.3 | 28.6 | 7.1 |
| Reading | | | |
| Within MN | 28.9 | 35.0 | 36.1 |
| Outside MN | 31.4 | 28.6 | 40.0 |
| Public | 31.7 | 33.3 | 35.0 |
| Private | 8.3 | 33.3 | 58.3 |
| Mainstreaming | | | |
| Within MN | 12.3 | 22.6 | 65.1 |
| Outside MN | 19.4 | 16.7 | 63.9 |
| Public | 14.7 | 20.2 | 65.1 |
| Private | 7.7 | 30.8 | 61.5 |

Table B

Percentages of Subjects Rating Their Preparation for Recognizing Four Types of Problems as Good, Fair, or Poor

| Problem | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Drugs | | | |
| Within MN | 18.3 | 33.0 | 48.6 |
| Outside MN | 13.9 | 33.0 | 52.8 |
| Public | 16.0 | 32.8 | 51.1 |
| Private | 28.6 | 35.7 | 35.7 |
| Abuse | | | |
| Within MN | 13.0 | 33.3 | 53.7 |
| Outside MN | 22.2 | 27.8 | 50.0 |
| Public | 13.8 | 31.5 | 54.6 |
| Private | 28.6 | 35.7 | 35.7 |
| LD | | | |
| Within MN | 21.6 | 40.5 | 37.8 |
| Outside MN | 36.1 | 30.6 | 33.3 |
| Public | 27.1 | 36.8 | 36.1 |
| Private | 7.1 | 50.0 | 42.8 |
| ED | | | |
| Within MN | 12.6 | 37.8 | 49.5 |
| Outside MN | 27.8 | 36.1 | 36.1 |
| Public | 17.3 | 36.8 | 45.9 |
| Private | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |

Table C

Percentages of Subjects Rating Their Preparation for Handling Students with Problems as Good, Fair, or Poor

| Group | Good | Fair | Poor |
|---|---|---|---|
| Within MN | 10.5 | 44.2 | 45.3 |
| Outside MN | 15.9 | 25.0 | 59.1 |
| Public | 13.6 | 36.8 | 49.6 |
| Private | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 |

Appendix B

Copy of Teacher Survey

IRLD
August, 1980

Teacher Survey

Great changes have occurred in the requirements made of teachers in today's educational systems. Information is needed on teachers' feelings about their preparation for these activities. Please answer the following questions to help us obtain this information. Your answers are confidential, and will be reported in a group summary only.

1. Years teaching experience: _____ What have you taught?

2. Certified in:

3. Level of education (indicate degree or hours):

4. Education courses were taken at (name school/schools):

   a.

   b.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5. | Rate the program(s) in which you were trained, in general (how well did it/they prepare you to teach?). | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| 6. | Specifically rate the following areas of your preparation: | | | |
| | a. Methods (exposed to a variety of methods) | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | b. Materials (learned about a variety of materials and sources for materials) | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | c. Child and adolescent development and psychology | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | d. How to teach reading | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | e. Mainstreaming methods | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | f. How to recognize students having problems with: | | | |
| | (1) Drugs | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | (2) Abuse | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | (3) Learning disabilities | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | (4) Emotional disturbance | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | (5) Other (what?) _____ | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |
| | g. How to handle students with problems in the above areas | GOOD | FAIR | POOR |

7. Do you think any major change should be made in teacher training programs? What? (Be specific!)



8. Other comments

PUBLICATIONS

Institute for Research on Learning Disabilities
University of Minnesota

The Institute is not funded for the distribution of its publications. Publications may be obtained for $3.00 per document, a fee designed to cover printing and postage costs. Only checks and money orders payable to the University of Minnesota can be accepted. All orders must be prepaid.

Requests should be directed to: Editor, IRLD, 350 Elliott Hall; 75 East River Road, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Ysseldyke, J. E. Assessing the learning disabled youngster: The state of the art (Research Report No. 1). November, 1977.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Regan, R. R. Nondiscriminatory assessment and decision making (Monograph No. 7). February, 1979.

Foster, G., Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. Susceptibility to stereotypic bias (Research Report No. 3). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B. An analysis of the disturbingness and acceptability of behaviors as a function of diagnostic label (Research Report No. 4). March, 1979.

Algozzine, B., & McGraw, K. Diagnostic testing in mathematics: An extension of the PIAT? (Research Report No. 5). March, 1979.

Deno, S. L. A direct observation approach to measuring classroom behavior: Procedures and application (Research Report No. 6). April, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Mirkin, P. K. Proceedings of the Minnesota round-table conference on assessment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 8). April, 1979.

Somwaru, J. P. A new approach to the assessment of learning disabilities (Monograph No. 9). April, 1979.

Algozzine, B., Forgnone, C., Mercer, C. D., & Trifiletti, J. J. Toward defining discrepancies for specific learning disabilities: An analysis and alternatives (Research Report No. 7). June, 1979.

Algozzine, B. The disturbing child: A validation report (Research Report No. 8). June, 1979.

Note: Monographs No. 1 - 6 and Research Report No. 2 are not available for distribution. These documents were part of the Institute's 1979-1980 continuation proposal, and/or are out of print.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & Potter, M. Technical adequacy of tests used by professionals in simulated decision making (Research Report No. 9). July, 1979.

Jenkins, J. R., Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Measuring pupil progress toward the least restrictive environment (Monograph No. 10). August, 1979.

Mirkin, P. K., & Deno, S. L. Formative evaluation in the classroom: An approach to improving instruction (Research Report No. 10). August, 1979.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Current assessment and decision-making practices in model programs for the learning disabled (Research Report No. 11). August, 1979.

Deno, S. L., Chiang, B., Tindal, G., & Blackburn, M. Experimental analysis of program components: An approach to research in CSDC's (Research Report No. 12). August, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Shinn, M., & McGue, M. Similarities and differences between underachievers and students labeled learning disabled: Identical twins with different mothers (Research Report No. 13). September, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, R. Perspectives on assessment of learning disabled students (Monograph No. 11). October, 1979.

Poland, S. F., Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Current assessment and decision-making practices in school settings as reported by directors of special education (Research Report No. 14). November, 1979.

McGue, M., Shinn, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Validity of the Woodcock-Johnson psycho-educational battery with learning disabled students (Research Report No. 15). November, 1979.

Deno, S., Mirkin, P., & Shinn, M. Behavioral perspectives on the assessment of learning disabled children (Monograph No. 12). November, 1979.

Sutherland, J. H., Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Young, S. What can I say after I say LD? (Research Report No. 16). December, 1979.

Deno, S. L., & Mirkin, P. K. Data-based IEP development: An approach to substantive compliance (Monograph No. 13). December, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., & McGue, M. The influence of test scores and naturally-occurring pupil characteristics on psycho-educational decision making with children (Research Report No. 17). December, 1979.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Decision makers' prediction of students' academic difficulties as a function of referral information (Research Report No. 18). December, 1979.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. Diagnostic classification decisions as a function of referral information (Research Report No. 19). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Chiang, B., & Lowry, L. Relationships among simple measures of reading and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 20). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Lowry, L., & Kuehnle, K. Relationships among simple measures of spelling and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 21). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., & Marston, D. Relationships among simple measures of written expression and performance on standardized achievement tests (Research Report No. 22). January, 1980.

Mirkin, P. K., Deno, S. L., Tindal, G., & Kuehnle, K. Formative evaluation: Continued development of data utilization systems (Research Report No. 23). January, 1980.

Deno, S. L., Mirkin, P. K., Robinson, S., & Evans, P. Relationships among classroom observations of social adjustment and sociometric rating scales (Research Report No. 24). January, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Factors influential on the psychoeducational decisions reached by teams of educators (Research Report No. 25). February, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Algozzine, B. Diagnostic decision making in individuals susceptible to biasing information presented in the referral case folder (Research Report No. 26). March, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Greener, J. W. Preliminary evidence on information considered useful in instructional planning (Research Report No. 27). March, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Regan, R. R., & Schwartz, S. Z. The use of technically adequate tests in psychoeducational decision making (Research Report No. 28). April, 1980.

Richey, L., Potter, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Teachers' expectations for the siblings of learning disabled and non-learning disabled students: A pilot study (Research Report No. 29). May, 1980.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Instructional planning: Information collected by school psychologists vs. information considered useful by teachers (Research Report No. 30). June, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Webber, J., Campbell, M., Moore, S., & Gilliam, J. Classroom decision making as a function of diagnostic labels and perceived competence (Research Report No. 31). June, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., Richey, L., & Thurlow, M. L. Psychoeducational assessment and decision making: A computer-simulated investigation (Research Report No. 32). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R. R., Potter, M., & Richey, L. Psychoeducational assessment and decision making: Individual case studies (Research Report No. 33). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Regan, R., Potter, M., & Richey, L. Technical supplement for computer-simulated investigations of the psychoeducational assessment and decision-making process (Research Report No. 34). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Stevens, L., Costello, C., Beattie, J., & Schmid, R. Classroom perspectives of LD and other special education teachers (Research Report No. 35). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Siders, J., Siders, J., & Beattie, J. Using assessment information to plan reading instructional programs: Error analysis and word attack skills (Monograph No. 14). July, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J., Shinn, M., & Epps, S. A comparison of the WISC-R and the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Cognitive Ability (Research Report No. 36). July, 1980.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. An analysis of difference score reliabilities on three measures with a sample of low achieving youngsters (Research Report No. 37). August, 1980.

Shinn, M., Algozzine, B., Marston, D., & Ysseldyke, J. A theoretical analysis of the performance of learning disabled students on the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Research Report No. 38). August, 1980.

Richey, L. S., Ysseldyke, J., Potter, M., Regan, R. R., & Greener, J. Teachers' attitudes and expectations for siblings of learning disabled children (Research Report No. 39). August, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). A naturalistic investigation of special education team meetings (Research Report No. 40). August, 1980.

Meyers, B., Meyers, J., & Deno, S. Formative evaluation and teacher decision making: A follow-up investigation (Research Report No. 41). September, 1980.

Fuchs, D., Garwick, D. R., Featherstone, N., & Fuchs, L. S. On the determinants and prediction of handicapped children's differential test performance with familiar and unfamiliar examiners (Research Report No. 42). September, 1980.

Algozzine, B., & Stoller, L. Effects of labels and competence on teachers' attributions for a student (Research Report No. 43). September, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Thurlow, M. L. (Eds.). The special education assessment and decision-making process: Seven case studies (Research Report No. 44). September, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozzine, B., Potter, M., & Regan, A. A descriptive study of students enrolled in a program for the severely learning disabled (Research Report No. 45). September, 1980.

Marston, D. Analysis of subtest scatter on the tests of cognitive ability from the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (Research Report No. 46). October, 1980.

Algozzine, B., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Shinn, M. Identifying children with learning disabilities: When is a discrepancy severe? (Research Report No. 47). November, 1980.

Fuchs, L., Tindal, J., & Deno, S. Effects of varying item domain and sample duration on technical characteristics of daily measures in reading (Research Report No. 48). January, 1981.

Marston, D., Lowry, L., Deno, S., & Mirkin, P. An analysis of learning trends in simple measures of reading, spelling, and written expression: A longitudinal study (Research Report No. 49). January, 1981.

Marston, D., & Deno, S. The reliability of simple, direct measures of written expression (Research Report No. 50). January, 1981.

Epps, S., McGue, M., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Inter-judge agreement in classifying students as learning disabled (Research Report No. 51). February, 1981.

Epps, S., Ysseldyke, J. E., & McGue, M. Differentiating LD and non-LD students: "I know one when I see one" (Research Report No. 52). March, 1981.

Evans, P. R., & Peham, M. A. S. Testing and measurement in occupational therapy: A review of current practice with special emphasis on the Southern California Sensory Integration Tests (Monograph No. 15). April, 1981.

Fuchs, L., Wesson, C., Tindal, G., & Mirkin, P. Teacher efficiency in continuous evaluation of IEP goals (Research Report No. 53). June, 1981.

Fuchs, D., Featherstone, N., Garwick, D. R., & Fuchs, L. S. The importance of situational factors and task demands to handicapped children's test performance (Research Report No. 54). June, 1981.

Tindal, G., & Deno, S. L. Daily measurement of reading: Effects of varying the size of the item pool (Research Report No. 55). July, 1981.

Fuchs, L. S., & Deno, S. L. A comparison of teacher judgment, standardized tests, and curriculum-based approaches to reading placement (Research Report No. 56). August, 1981.

Fuchs, L., & Deno, S. The relationship between curriculum-based mastery measures and standardized achievement tests in reading (Research Report No. 57). August, 1981.

Christenson, S., Graden, J., Potter, M., & Ysseldyke, J. Current research on psychoeducational assessment and decision making: Implications for training and practice (Monograph No. 16). September, 1981.

Christenson, S., Ysseldyke, J., & Algozzine, B. Institutional constraints and external pressures influencing referral decisions (Research Report No. 58). October, 1981.

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., & Deno, S. Reliability and validity of curriculum-based informal reading inventories (Research Report No. 59). October, 1981.

Algozzine, B., Christenson, S., & Ysseldyke, J. Probabilities associated with the referral-to-placement process (Research Report No. 60). November, 1981.

Tindal, G., Fuchs, L. Christenson, S., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. The relationship between student achievement and teacher assessment of short- or long-term goals (Research Report No. 61). November, 1981.

Mirkin, P., Fuchs, L., Tindal, G., Christenson, S., & Deno, S. The effect of IEP monitoring strategies on teacher behavior (Research Report No. 62). December, 1981.

Wesson, C., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. Teachers' use of self instructional materials for learning procedures for developing and monitoring progress on IEP goals (Research Report No. 63). January, 1982.

Fuchs, L., Wesson, C., Tindal, G., Mirkin, P., & Deno, S. Instructional changes, student performance, and teacher preferences: The effects of specific measurement and evaluation procedures (Research Report No. 64). January, 1982.

Potter, M., & Mirkin, P. Instructional planning and implementation practices of elementary and secondary resource room teachers: Is there a difference? (Research Report No. 65). January, 1982.

Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Teachers' beliefs about LD students (Research Report No. 66). January, 1982.

Graden, J., Thurlow, M. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. Academic engaged time and its relationship to learning: A review of the literature (Monograph No. 17). January, 1982.

King, R., Wesson, C., & Deno, S. Direct and frequent measurement of student performance: Does it take too much time? (Research Report No. 67). February, 1982.

Greener, J. W., & Thurlow, M. L. Teacher opinions about professional education training programs (Research Report No. 68). March, 1982.